

(1) IN GENERAL.—From the amounts appropriated under subsection (g) and beginning after the earlier of the date of submission of the GAO study on automation or October 1, 2022, the Secretary of Labor shall award grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible partnerships to support demonstration and pilot projects relating to the training needs of workers who are, or are likely to become, dislocated workers as a result of automation.

(2) DURATION.—A grant awarded under this section shall be for a period not to exceed 4 years.

(3) USE OF REPORT.—The Secretary shall use the GAO study on automation to inform the grant program carried out under this section.

(b) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an eligible partnership shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary shall reasonably require.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a description of the demonstration or pilot project to be completed with the grant funds, which description shall include—

(A) a description of the members of the eligible partnership who will be involved in the demonstration or pilot program and the services each member will provide;

(B) a description of the training services that will be available to individuals participating in the demonstration or pilot project, which may include—

(i) a plan to train dislocated workers from industries likely to be impacted by automation and transition the workers into regionally in-demand industry sectors or occupations; and

(ii) a plan to partner with local businesses to retrain, upskill, and re-deploy workers within an industry as an alternative to layoffs;

(C) a plan to provide workers with technology-based skills training, which may include training to provide skills related to coding, systems engineering, or information technology security, in addition to other skills; and

(D) a description of the goals that the eligible partnership intends to achieve to upskill workers and prepare them for in-demand industry sectors or occupations.

(c) PRIORITIES.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to—

(1) eligible partnerships that are located in an area with a high concentration of—

(A) industries with a higher likelihood of being impacted by automation; or

(B) industries included in in-demand industry sectors, as determined under subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B) of section 3(23) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102(23));

(2) eligible partnerships—

(A) with a plan to provide incumbent worker training—

(i) to assist workers in obtaining the skills necessary to retain employment or avert layoffs; or

(ii) that allows a worker working for an employer to acquire new skills that allow the worker to obtain a higher-skilled or higher-paid position with such employer; and

(B) that partner with local employers that intend to backfill the pre-training positions of the incumbent workers by hiring new workers to fill those positions;

(3) eligible partnerships that will provide workers with a transportation stipend, paid sick leave, paid family and medical leave, access to child care services, or other employment benefits; or

(4) eligible partnerships with a plan to develop a shared training curriculum that can be used across local and regional networks of employers and training providers.

(d) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible partnership that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds for 1 or more of the following:

(1) Providing training services under the demonstration or pilot project, which may include training services that prepare workers for in-demand industry sectors or occupations.

(2) Providing assistance for employers in developing a staff position for an individual who will be responsible for supporting training services provided under the grant.

(3) Purchasing equipment or technology necessary for training services provided under paragraph (1).

(4) Providing job search and other transitional assistance to workers in industries with high rates of job loss.

(5) Providing a training stipend to workers for training services.

(6) Providing integrated education and training.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after an eligible partnership's completion of a demonstration or pilot project supported under this section, the eligible partnership shall prepare and submit to the Secretary a report regarding—

(1) the number of workers who received training services through the demonstration or pilot project, disaggregated by type of training service and the age, gender, and race of the workers;

(2) the number of such workers who successfully transitioned into a new position following completion of the training services;

(3) the number of individuals who successfully transitioned into an in-demand industry sector or occupation following completion of the training services;

(4) annual earnings data for individuals who have completed training services through the demonstration or pilot project;

(5) the percentage of individuals described in paragraph (4) who are in education or training activities, or in employment, during the second quarter after exit from the training services;

(6) the percentage of individuals described in paragraph (4) who are in education or training activities, or in employment, during the fourth quarter after exit from the training services; and

(7) any practices used by the partnership that should be considered best practices with respect to training workers in industries that have, or are expected to have, high rates of job loss as a result of automation.

(f) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS.—An eligible partnership that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds in a manner that is consistent with the labor standards and protections described in section 181 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3241) and nondiscrimination provisions described in section 188 of such Act (29 U.S.C. 3248).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for the first 5 full fiscal years beginning after the earlier of the date of submission of the GAO study on automation or October 1, 2022.

SEC. 5. EXPANSION OF WORKER TRAINING SERVICES.

(a) ADULT AND DISLOCATED WORKER EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING.—Section 134(d)(1)(A) of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3174(d)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (xi), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in clause (xii), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(xiii) training programs for individuals who are, or are likely to become, dislocated workers as a result of automation, including activities that prepare the individuals for occupations in the technology sector.”.

(b) NATIONAL DISLOCATED WORKER GRANTS.—Section 170 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3225) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)(A), by inserting “advances in automation technology,” before “plant closures,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—In addition to any funds reserved under section 132(a)(2)(A) to carry out this section, there are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2022 through 2026.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 164—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE NUMBER OF JUSTICES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES SHOULD REMAIN AT 9

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 164

Whereas the first section of the Act entitled “An Act to amend the Judicial System of the United States”, approved April 10, 1869 (commonly known as the “Judiciary Act of 1869”) (16 Stat. 44; chapter 22), states that “the Supreme Court of the United States shall hereafter consist of the Chief Justice of the United States and eight associate justices”;

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has consisted of a Chief Justice and 8 associate Justices for 152 years;

Whereas previous attempts to increase the number of justices on the Supreme Court of the United States have been rejected and widely condemned by individuals of both political parties;

Whereas, in 1937, when former President Franklin Delano Roosevelt proposed the Judicial Procedures Reform Bill of 1937, a bill that sought to expand the number of justices on the Supreme Court of the United States from 9 justices to 15 Justices, he was harshly criticized by both parties and his own Vice President, John Nance Garner;

Whereas, the 1937 Senate Judiciary Committee report, in response to the Court-packing plan by President Roosevelt, decried the plan as “a needless, futile, and utterly dangerous abandonment of constitutional principle”, that “[i]ts ultimate operation would be to make this government one of men rather than one of law” and that it was “a measure, which should be so emphatically rejected that its parallel will never again be presented to the free representatives of the free people of America”;

Whereas, during the Trump Administration, Democrats have refused to recognize the legitimacy of nominations made by President Trump to the Supreme Court of the United States and have advocated for packing the Court with additional justices appointed by a future Democrat president;

Whereas, in 1983 during a Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, then-Senator Joe Biden

noted that Court packing was a “bonehead idea” and “a terrible, terrible mistake” that “put in question for an entire decade the independence of the most significant body—including the Congress, in my view—the most significant body in this country, the Supreme Court of the United States of America”;

Whereas, in 2005 during a speech on the Senate floor, then-Senator Joe Biden praised members of the Democrat Party for their “act of courage” in opposing the Court-packing plan of President Roosevelt, which he described as a “power grab”;

Whereas, in 2019, the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg stated, “I think it was a bad idea when President Franklin Roosevelt tried to pack the Court”, and that “if anything would make the Court look partisan, it would be that”;

Whereas, in 2021, Justice Stephen Breyer urged supporters of court packing to “think long and hard” about undermining the independence of the court, noting that it is imperative the public “trust that the court is guided by legal principle, not politics” and that “structural alteration motivated by the perception of political influence can only feed that latter perception, further eroding that trust”;

Whereas the Constitution of the United States is based on the principle of separation of powers to provide for checks and balances on each branch of the Federal Government and expanding the Supreme Court of the United States purely for political advantage threatens the separation of powers and the system of checks and balances established in the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the Federal judiciary is insulated from political influence through lifetime appointments and other measures to preserve its independence and an attempt to expand the Supreme Court of the United States purely for political purposes threatens the independence and integrity of the Supreme Court and, thus, the entirety of the judiciary it oversees; and

Whereas any attempt to increase the number of justices of the Supreme Court of the United States or “pack the Court” would undermine the democratic institutions and destroy the credibility of the highest court in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate opposes any attempt to increase the number of justices of the Supreme Court of the United States or otherwise pack the Court.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1445. Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WARNOCK)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 937, to facilitate the expedited review of COVID-19 hate crimes, and for other purposes.

SA 1446. Mr. WARNOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 937, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1445. Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WARNOCK)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 937, to facilitate the expedited review of COVID-19 hate crimes, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the first word and insert the following:

1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Following the spread of COVID-19 in 2020, there has been a dramatic increase in hate crimes and violence against Asian-Americans and Pacific Islanders.

(2) According to a recent report, there were nearly 3,800 reported cases of anti-Asian discrimination and incidents related to COVID-19 between March 19, 2020, and February 28, 2021, in all 50 States and the District of Columbia.

(3) During this time frame, race has been cited as the primary reason for discrimination, making up over 90 percent of incidents, and the United States condemns and denounces any and all anti-Asian and Pacific Islander sentiment in any form.

(4) Roughly 36 percent of these incidents took place at a business and more than 2,000,000 Asian-American businesses have contributed to the diverse fabric of American life.

(5) More than 1,900,000 Asian-American and Pacific Islander older adults, particularly those older adults who are recent immigrants or have limited English proficiency, may face even greater challenges in dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic, including discrimination, economic insecurity, and language isolation.

(6) In the midst of this alarming surge in anti-Asian hate crimes and incidents, a shooter murdered the following 8 people in the Atlanta, Georgia region, 7 of whom were women and 6 of whom were women of Asian descent:

- (A) Xiaojie Tan.
- (B) Daoyou Feng.
- (C) Delaina Ashley Yaun González.
- (D) Paul Andre Michels.
- (E) Soon Chung Park.
- (F) Hyun Jung Grant.
- (G) Suncha Kim.
- (H) Yong Ae Yue.

(7) The people of the United States will always remember the victims of these shootings and stand in solidarity with those affected by this senseless tragedy and incidents of hate that have affected the Asian and Pacific Islander communities.

SEC. 3. REVIEW OF HATE CRIMES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 7 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall designate an officer or employee of the Department of Justice whose responsibility during the applicable period shall be to facilitate the expedited review of hate crimes (as described in section 249 of title 18, United States Code) and reports of any such crime to Federal, State, local, or Tribal law enforcement agencies.

(b) **APPLICABLE PERIOD DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “applicable period” means the period beginning on the date on which the officer or employee is designated under subsection (a), and ending on the date that is 1 year after the date on which the emergency period described in subparagraph (B) of section 1135(g)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320b-5(g)(1)) ends, except that the Attorney General may extend such period as appropriate.

SEC. 4. GUIDANCE.

(a) **GUIDANCE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.**—The Attorney General shall issue guidance for State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies, pursuant to this Act and other applicable law, on how to—

(1) establish online reporting of hate crimes or incidents, and to have online reporting that is equally effective for people with disabilities as for people without disabilities available in multiple languages as determined by the Attorney General;

(2) collect data disaggregated by the protected characteristics described in section 249 of title 18, United States Code; and

(3) expand public education campaigns aimed at raising awareness of hate crimes and reaching victims, that are equally effective for people with disabilities as for people without disabilities.

(b) **GUIDANCE RELATING TO COVID-19 PANDEMIC.**—The Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with the COVID-19 Health Equity Task Force and community-based organizations, shall issue guidance aimed at raising awareness of hate crimes during the COVID-19 pandemic.

SEC. 5. JABARA-HEYER NO HATE ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Khalid Jabara and Heather Heyer National Opposition to Hate, Assault, and Threats to Equality Act of 2021” or the “Jabara-Heyer NO HATE Act”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds the following:

(1) The incidence of violence known as hate crimes, or crimes motivated by bias, poses a serious national problem.

(2) According to data obtained by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the incidence of such violence increased in 2019, the most recent year for which data is available.

(3) In 1990, Congress enacted the Hate Crime Statistics Act (Public Law 101-275; 28 U.S.C. 534 note) to provide the Federal Government, law enforcement agencies, and the public with data regarding the incidence of hate crime. The Hate Crime Statistics Act and the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act (division E of Public Law 111-84; 123 Stat. 2835) have enabled Federal authorities to understand and, where appropriate, investigate and prosecute hate crimes.

(4) A more complete understanding of the national problem posed by hate crime is in the public interest and supports the Federal interest in eradicating bias-motivated violence referenced in section 249(b)(1)(C) of title 18, United States Code.

(5) However, a complete understanding of the national problem posed by hate crimes is hindered by incomplete data from Federal, State, and local jurisdictions through the Uniform Crime Reports program authorized under section 534 of title 28, United States Code, and administered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(6) Multiple factors contribute to the provision of inaccurate and incomplete data regarding the incidence of hate crime through the Uniform Crime Reports program. A significant contributing factor is the quality and quantity of training that State and local law enforcement agencies receive on the identification and reporting of suspected bias-motivated crimes.

(7) The problem of crimes motivated by bias is sufficiently serious, widespread, and interstate in nature as to warrant Federal financial assistance to States and local jurisdictions.

(8) Federal financial assistance with regard to certain violent crimes motivated by bias enables Federal, State, and local authorities to work together as partners in the investigation and prosecution of such crimes.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **HATE CRIME.**—The term “hate crime” means an act described in section 245, 247, or 249 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631).

(2) **PRIORITY AGENCY.**—The term “priority agency” means—

(A) a law enforcement agency of a unit of local government that serves a population of not less than 100,000, as computed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation; or

(B) a law enforcement agency of a unit of local government that—